



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE SCHOOL REVIEW

A JOURNAL OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

VOLUME XVIII  
NUMBER 4

---

APRIL, 1910

---

WHOLE  
NUMBER 174

## LATIN COMPOSITION IN THE HIGH SCHOOL

### I. AS THE COLLEGE CONCEIVES IT

---

WM. GARDNER HALE  
The University of Chicago

---

Latin composition has the name of being a hard and disagreeable study. The second supposed quality follows from the first. It will be worth while to inquire how far the hardness is due to the aims which we set ourselves, and the methods which we use. A rough index of the former may be seen in college-entrance examinations in composition—which nearly every college prints, even if it admits almost wholly by certificate. An exact index of both the former and the latter is afforded by our composition manuals. I shall accordingly consider printed tests in the present paper, and books in another.

In making this examination, I proceed upon the conviction (generally held) that composition is capable of being a most effective instrument in the learning of a language; and I do not debate this point.

Its primary purpose is to enable the student to *read* Latin more easily. It is intended mainly to fix forms and constructions in his mind (words in lesser degree), so that, as he meets them in his Latin authors, he shall more easily and more surely recognize their force—that is, more easily and more surely apprehend the *meaning* of his author. This must always remain, for the schools, the leading purpose, and everything else should be made subservient to it. But it is also true, and important, that the writing of Latin, properly done, affords an excellent training

in clear thinking, and, in proportion to its advancement, will react favorably upon the student's power of effective and discriminating expression in his own language.

My own interest in the subject (together with my justification in writing the present paper) is due in part to my having taught it in regular Caesar classes in the University High School, in connection with teachers' training courses in the University of Chicago. My dissatisfaction with the material which I found available in this work led me to experiments of my own, and these led me to write a book, soon to be issued from the press. This last fact, I trust, does not disqualify me for expressing opinions. We have far too little debate in America between men who directly represent differing views. I, for one, should welcome criticism from those who are doing the same kind of work with myself, provided that it is specific, not vague. Europe is far in advance of us in this respect. In general, the reviewers sought by European journals are men who have themselves published in the respective fields.

As a member of the Commission on College-Entrance Requirements in Latin (the report was published in the February number of this journal), I prepared a paper before our meeting, embodying the results of a careful study of examination papers in composition, and offering recommendations looking toward reform. Such a study is valuable, in spite of the fact that most students are now admitted on certificate. For, first, the papers published by colleges admitting in this way represent what these institutions presumably ask of the schools which their inspectors visit and accredit, or do not accredit. And, second, but much more important, our composition books, with few exceptions, are made by teachers in schools which send a considerable proportion of their students to colleges admitting only upon examination; and it is inevitable that the authors should have these examinations in mind. There is positive proof that they do; the Dodge and Tuttle, Daniell and Brown, Allen and Phillips, and Bennett books, for example, give *specimens* of such papers, prepared by examiners in colleges from Maine to California. The books made under these influences are used throughout the

country. The question whether the examination papers set in composition by our colleges are wise and just is thus one which, directly or indirectly, concerns us all; and I start with this inquiry. I have the most recent papers of the better-known institutions at my hand. But, while they differ individually, they do not differ appreciably *as a class* from those which I used from the last edition of the Daniell-Brown book of 1905, in preparing my study for our commission; and I accordingly avail myself of the results then reached, reproducing a few of the papers, together with two more recent ones given by Harvard and the College Entrance Examination Board. Without actual specimens of papers, criticism would be useless.

It should be premised that the elementary composition paper of the colleges requiring examination, and of many which admit mainly by certificate, corresponds in theory to two years of work in composition, that is, in the average case, to the second and third years of the schools (the years, generally, of Caesar and Cicero reading); while the advanced paper corresponds in theory to the fourth year (the year, generally, of the Virgil reading). A complication, of course, takes place in cases where Virgil is read in the third year, and Cicero in the fourth.

#### ELEMENTARY EXAMINATIONS

BOWDOIN, JUNE, 1905

I alone, a general clad-in-the-toga, seem likely to (to be about to) quell this war. Under my administration (abl. abs.) not even wickedness will suffer punishment. But by manifest recklessness, by dangers threatening the fatherland, this leniency can be destroyed (*intereo*). But if this shall happen, no good (man) and few bad (men) will be put to death (*intereo*).

HARVARD, JUNE, 1905

You all see that the wickedness of my enemies has been stirred up by somebody. If they should repent of their fury, they would gain great glory. But these men are so base that I am prepared to threaten them with death.

DARTMOUTH, JUNE, 1905

In no other case since the founding of the city have all good men held one and the same opinion. Senators and knights are so agreed that they vie with each other in love of country. And if this harmony shall have been confirmed during my consulship, we may hope that it will be perpetual.

PRINCETON, JUNE, 1905

Translate into Latin section A and either B or C.

A. 1. If Caesar had not led his cavalry against the Gauls, he could not have conquered them.

2. When the Gauls saw that he would attack them, they retreated in another direction.

3. Cicero made a speech for the purpose of driving Catiline from Rome.

B. Caesar wished to cross the river in order to drive the enemy from their camp, which had been placed on the top of a hill. For he had been told that they had come out from their camp and were plundering the country, and that, although his light-armed troops had attacked them, they had not fled.

C. I will manage the matter in such a way, citizens, that the wicked shall suffer punishment for their crimes, and, trusting to the help of the gods, I promise you that if you punish these few men, the whole city will be safe.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, JANUARY, 1905

Scipio heard that Hannibal was in Gaul and at once sent a few horsemen to learn what he was doing. Laelius, who was in command of these soldiers, left camp at the third hour. When he had marched four days, he came to a large river. Having crossed this by a bridge, he pitched camp. Laelius thought that his men could not be attacked by the enemy, because the camp was surrounded by such a wide river that the latter could not cross it.

HARVARD, JUNE, 1908

Larcus and Herminius, seeing Horatius stand alone, ran across the bridge to help him; and these three men fought so bravely that the enemy were afraid. "If the Etruscans cross the river," said Horatius, "our city will be captured."

COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD, JUNE, 1909

The next day Sempronius, on learning that the enemy was approaching, sent Cassius with fifteen hundred soldiers to occupy a hill which was distant about two miles, for the purpose of resisting the enemy and delaying his march as long as possible. He himself remained where he was, to see whether the troops he has asked of the senate would come to his assistance; if they did not he had determined to defend his camp by every means for he hoped that the approach of winter would force his opponents to retire into winter quarters.

## ADVANCED EXAMINATIONS

HARVARD, JUNE, 1905

Caesar, fearing that Dumnorix would stir up the Gauls, determined to take him into Britain. But Dumnorix said to the Gauls that Caesar would

kill all whom he took across the sea. Accordingly, while the Romans were so busy with the ships that no one noticed him, he left the camp, accompanied by horsemen. But Caesar sent other horsemen to bring him back, and said to them, "If he should not obey you, kill him." Dumnorix did resist and was killed, shouting that he was a free man in a free state.—Based on Caesar, *Gallic War*, v. 6, 7.

DARTMOUTH, JUNE, 1905

He even confesses that he is an enemy, and now that we have a wall between him and us, why should we fear either Catiline or those who do not hesitate to follow that worst of leaders into the most shameful of crimes? Much more to be dreaded now are those who still remain at Rome, since by concealing their hatred they may deceive you all, and yet we do not so much desire to punish them as to reform them, if it can be done.

PRINCETON, JUNE, 1905

Let us now determine what limits there are in friendship. I find that there are current three opinions, but I do not agree with any of them. In my opinion they are worthy of friendship, in whom there exists a reason why they should be loved. Yet most men pick their friends as they do cattle, those from whom they hope to receive the greatest advantage. Such men never find that most beautiful and natural friendship, which is desirable for itself alone, for a true friend is as it were a second self.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, JUNE, 1905

Upon this point I will not say more at present. Last of all there was the fact that a seasonable return from this region rather than a longer advance was sought by our soldiers. Mithridates, on the other hand, had strengthened the army which had been collected from his own kingdom, and was aided by the forces of many kings and nations. Now we have observed that it is wont to happen that the misfortunes of kings easily win the aid of many, especially of those who either are kings or live in a kingdom, so that the royal name seems to be great and holy.

The first thing that must strike the reader is that the papers of the same grade are of very unequal length. The Harvard elementary paper, for example, is just half as long as the University of California paper. The Leland Stanford Jr. paper, which I have not printed, is twice as long as that of California, or four times as long as Harvard's.

The second striking fact is that the subjects of three of the elementary papers are taken from the *Cicero* cycle of ideas. This is because most of the colleges that set papers in examina-

tion set two only, not three. In order, then, to be sure that the student has had composition in his third year (which is ordinarily the year for reading Cicero), they feel that the paper must be of the Cicero kind. The natural temptation then is to make the advanced paper cover the omitted range of ideas, and so, inverting the natural order, to set one of the *Caesar* kind, as in the case of the Harvard paper. The difficulty, which would not exist if there were three papers, is inherent in the system. But the colleges are unwilling to increase the number of examinations, and there is therefore probably no direct remedy. The indirect remedy, so far as there can be one, would be to frame the English passages for translation in such a way as to demand, *in considerable variety*, those constructions which are most common in Caesar and Cicero taken together.

The Princeton elementary paper permits a choice in the second half, and thus provides for an examination mainly on the Caesar range of ideas, if the student prefers. The actual situation would have been better met if B had been omitted, so that the student would have been obliged to translate a passage of *each* kind.

The Princeton advanced paper deals with still another range of ideas, and is, in point of fact, founded on Cicero *De amicitia*, the first sentence being taken from xvi. 56, the second from xxi. 79, and so on. This lies outside of what most students read.

Let us now examine some of the papers in greater detail. The Bowdoin, Harvard, and Dartmouth elementary papers involve few constructions, and these do not include the ones that are most frequent either in Cicero or in Caesar. The Harvard paper, alone of the three, has any construction in indirect discourse, and the sole example is that of the infinitive of statement. The clause of result appears in the Harvard and Dartmouth papers, but not in the Bowdoin paper. There is no example of purpose in any of the papers, none of *cum*, *ubi*, *ut*, *postquam*, or *simul atque* in narration, none of the causal or adversative *cum*-clauses, none of subjunctive substantive clauses. Yet the clauses specified, together with clauses in indirect discourse (including indirect questions), are, with the clause of result, by far the

most common of all subjunctive constructions, alike in Caesar and in Cicero. If the student ought to learn to use them in his composition work, some of them, certainly, ought to be brought into the elementary paper.

So far, probably everybody would agree with me. But I should go farther.

For "threaten" in the Harvard elementary paper, the word wanted is *minor*, *minitor*, or *comminor*, and the construction is that of the dative and accusative. *Comminor* is late, and does not occur anywhere in Cicero or Caesar. *Minitor* does not occur in Caesar. It occurs four times in Cic. *Cat.*, *Pomp.*, *Arch.*:<sup>1</sup> once with accusative and no dative, *quam (mortem) illi fortasse minitantur* (*Cat.* iv. 10, 20), where *illi* is nominative plural; once with an ablative of "instrument" (*ferro flammaque*) and dative (*Cat.* ii. 1, 1) once with dative and an ablative of a different kind, *magnis copiis* (*Pomp.* xv. 45); and once with dative alone (*Pomp.* xx. 60). *Minor* does not occur in Caesar. It occurs in Cic. *Cat.*, *Pomp.*, *Arch.* but once (*Pomp.* xx. 58), and here with neither an accusative nor a dative. Thus the student who is passing the elementary examination, and has read both Caesar and Cicero, has seen the accusative with a verb "threaten" but once, and has never seen the combination of accusative and dative.

For "repent" in the Harvard elementary paper, *paenitet* is wanted. It occurs once in the *Gallic War*, and with a genitive (iv. 5), and once in Cic. *Cat.*, *Pomp.*, *Arch.*, with a genitive, of which there are two examples, connected by *atque* (*Cat.* iv. 10, 20), and once, without a genitive, in *Aen.* i-vi (i. 549). The construction is thus not only relatively difficult, but relatively rare.

It belongs, to be sure, to a much esteemed rule—the use of the genitive with the impersonal verb, *miseret*, *paenitet*, *piget*, *pudet*, and *taedet*, and the personal verbs, *miseretor* and *miseresco*; and that is the reason for bringing it in. Let us see, then, how things stand with this construction in high-school Latin. *Paenitet* has been dealt with. The other words do not occur in the Caesar

<sup>1</sup> My statements are based on these six orations, because they are the ones most commonly read in the schools. They are the ones on which Lodge bases the Cicero part of his *Vocabulary*, to be mentioned below.



or Cicero. *Miseret* occurs with a genitive in *Aen.* v. 354, *misereor* in ii. 143, 144, iv. 318, 435, vi. 117 (two examples); *piget* in v. 678 (two), *pertaesum* in iv. 18 (two) and v. 714 (two). Taking the "rule" as a whole, then, we have one example in *B.G.* i-iv, two (together) in *Cic. Cat., Pomp., Arch.*, and thirteen in *Aen.* i-vi. Obviously, though the construction is still rare at the end of the third high-school year, it should be treated in that year, that is, in a composition book of the *Cicero* grade, for the sake of the Virgil reading which is to come; and it may fairly be asked for in an examination which covers Caesar and Cicero. The Harvard paper is therefore technically justified at this point; and we have incidentally reached a specimen of the more difficult questions which any careful maker of a composition book must face, and of the nature of the solution. But surely, in view of the rarity of this particular construction at this stage, it is not entitled to crowd out any of the common constructions. The total range of noun-constructions in the Harvard paper is small, and the rare ones with *paenitet* and *minitor* form too large a proportion of the whole. The maker of the paper has forced the student to stake too much upon a little.

The Princeton elementary paper, in A, sentence 1, "if Caesar had not led his cavalry against the Gauls, he could not have conquered them," calls for a knowledge of the special Roman idiom of the indicative in conclusions contrary to fact with verbs of obligation, ability, etc., and a discrimination in favor of it as against the subjunctive, or the opposite. The construction occurs but once in Caesar, and, even there, in the *indirect* form (*non fuisse difficile*, i. 14). It is one of the most puzzling constructions in Latin, and not suitable for an elementary paper.

I add brief illustrations from other elementary papers which there is not space to print in full.

The University of California paper of January, 1909, calls for the ablative with *opus est*. The construction occurs but once in the *Gallic War* (and that, too, in the *complex* form, *si quid opus facto esset*, i. 42), while it does not occur at all in *Cic. Cat., Pomp., Arch.*

The University of Chicago paper of 1905 (which is intended for students at the end of the second high-school year) calls for the conclusion contrary to fact in indirect discourse. This peculiarly difficult construction occurs only twice in Caesar, i-iv (i. 34 and i. 14), and the matter is further complicated by the fact that the second example (*non fuisse difficile*, mentioned above) represents a very un-English idiom. Thus the construction which the student is expected to write has been seen but once in his reading.

The Leland Stanford Jr. elementary paper reprinted by Daniell and Brown calls for the verb *interest*, "it is for the advantage of . . . , " with the genitive of a noun, or the ablative feminine of the possessive pronoun (in this particular case, the latter). The student has seen the genitive in one place (*B.G.* ii. 5), with two examples, coupled by *-que*, and the ablative of the possessive adjective in one place (*Cic. Cat.* iv. 5, 9). This belongs, then, to the rarer constructions. But I should add that, with this exception, the Stanford paper is good, and that it is of sufficient length to reduce materially the risk which the candidate runs through the intrusion of the rare and difficult construction.

We turn to the advanced composition. The Harvard paper is excellent, but it is elementary in its vocabulary, its constructions, and its range of ideas—in other words, in every respect. A student reasonably trained in composition of the Caesar grade should have no trouble in passing the *advanced* paper; whereas we have seen that, in order to be able to pass well the *elementary* paper spoken of above, a student must have had composition of the Cicero grade, at least. Putting aside the matter of length and vocabulary, each of the Harvard papers would have been better suited to its purpose if the advanced one had been made the elementary, and the elementary the advanced.

To this general criticism let me add a somewhat careful test of the respective vocabularies called for. I have translated the two Harvard papers into simple Latin, giving every benefit of doubt. For the elementary paper under discussion, I used 29 words. Of these, 10 occur less than five times each in *B.G.* i-iv. For the advanced paper, I used 63 words. Of these, 7 occur less

than five times each in *B.G.* i-iv. Of the *advanced* vocabulary, then, only 11 per cent. appear less than five times in the reading of the *Caesar* year, while of the *elementary* vocabulary, 34 per cent. appear less than five times in that reading. That is to say, at the end of his second year in the high school a student would be better equipped, so far as vocabulary is concerned, to take the advanced paper than to take the elementary one. Further, of the 10 words in the elementary paper (on a Cicero subject) which appear less than five times in *B.G.* i-iv, 4 appear less than five times also in *Cic. Cat.*, *Pomp.*, *Arch.*, or, if one counts adjectives and related adverbs together (as *turpis* and *turpiter*), 3; and 2 of these appear less than five times in the ordinary Caesar and Cicero put together. This last number (2) is 7 per cent. of 29. So, then, at the end of two years in the high school a student would find but 11 per cent. of what may be called unfamiliar words, if he took the paper which belonged *a year ahead of him*, while at the end of three years he would still find 7 per cent. of unfamiliar words if he took the paper which belonged *one year behind him*.

With the dropping of the two rare constructions and the changing of the vocabulary, this Harvard elementary paper would be a very easy one. As it is, it is distinctly a hard one, as any teacher can learn by setting a fairly good third-year student at work upon it.

On the other hand, the Harvard elementary paper of June, 1908, is a very easy one, and, in my judgment, an insufficient test. The difference between this and the other paper is immense. I would suggest that the same young man be asked to write both. It has been done for me (by two high-school students), and the comparison is startling.

The University of California elementary paper is an admirable one in every way. The proper names are different from those which the student has had in his reading; but to this there can be no objection, since their inflection is simple. The vocabulary otherwise, and the constructions, and the range of ideas, are the same as in Caesar. The paper is also of suitable length.

The elementary paper of the College Entrance Board is a

little more difficult than the California paper, but it is perfectly reasonable. It calls for a considerable variety of constructions. But these are all common, like the words. A student risks far less upon chance in facing such a paper than in facing one that contains only a few constructions, but includes rare ones.

We return to the advanced papers. The Princeton paper reprinted in our collection, without calling for much knowledge of constructions, is distinctly difficult in vocabulary. Thus "are, current" is hard to match (Cicero uses *ferri*). "In my opinion," *mea sententia*, seems easy to an instructor in Latin, but the student sees it only once (*Pomp.* xx. 58) in all his presumable high-school reading. "A second self" would be difficult for the candidate, though, to the older man, Cicero's *alter idem*, from *De amicitia* xxi. 80, is familiar.

I have not yet mentioned the most remarkable thing about the advanced papers. It is that, as a class, *they do not call for anything like so large a proportion of the rare and difficult constructions as the elementary papers do.* This appears to be true, not only in the papers which I have reprinted, but throughout the sets of selections given by the composition books mentioned, and throughout the additional papers which I have had at hand. As things have thus far been, the best advice to give to a teacher would be, "for an elementary examination, drill your students on the rare constructions; for an advanced examination, drill them on the common ones." I am confident, in view of the action of our commission, even if the present article should have no effect, that this state of things will be reformed.

An indirect result of the grouping of years in our composition papers should not be overlooked. The elementary examination, as has already been said, is taken after the student has read his Caesar and his Cicero. He must have had composition in both years in order reasonably to hope to pass it. If he has performed his work fairly well, he has nothing to do in order to pass the *advanced* composition a year later, except not to forget. To accomplish this end, a few desultory exercises are likely to be given. There is no inducement to the teacher to carry on systematic work. The case is, of course, still worse with

the schools which send most of their students into college by certificate. But, if the writing of Latin is a helpful training, it ought not to be dropped at the end of the third year. The only remedy is that the colleges requiring examinations should prepare advanced papers which, without being unreasonable, will be searching, and should *mark* them rigorously; and that colleges admitting on certificate should decline to accredit in Latin where composition is not made a regular part of the work of the fourth year.

A word is also needed with regard to the prevalent idea that so-called "simple" or "detached" sentences are easier than connected sentences. The exact opposite is true. Other things being equal, a sentence is *easier* to translate if it has context to resolve any question about the meaning. The mere fact of passing from one set of ideas to another increases the difficulty. Think how enormously harder the *Gallic War*, for example, would be, if no two successive sentences were consecutive!

The real difficulty in this matter, just as in the matter of rational and connected Latin and English for the first-year books, and of similar English in the composition books, lies, not with the student, but with the *author* of the particular examination paper or elementary book or composition book. It often costs great labor (less for the examination papers than for the books) to make, under the limitations of proper vocabulary, syntax, and cycle of ideas, a piece of English or Latin that shall say nothing foolish, and that shall knit together what it says. But it is worth while that the author should be put to this labor, since it is worth while for the student to get the idea that Latin was the language of a people that said sensible things, and said them consecutively. The material given in composition papers should consist of consecutive sentences, printed in one mass, or in paragraphs, according to the contents.

In what has thus far been said, I have assumed as obvious that the words, constructions, and range of ideas in examination papers in composition should be such as are common in the reading to which they correspond. Now, it has appeared, in our examination of actual papers, that, in justice to students, the

makers of the papers *must not trust their feelings* as to what is common, in words or constructions. Fortunately, there are now helps by which they may test their impressions.

Browne's *Latin Word-List* (Ginn and Co.), a little vest-pocket book of about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  by  $5\frac{1}{4}$  inches, presents the vocabulary of Caesar's *Gallic War* and *Civil War* and of Cicero's *Orations* (entire) arranged in the order of frequency, and by the parts of speech, with an extremely ingenious but simple device by which one may have the translations either covered, or open and directly beside the respective words, and may start from either the Latin or the English side. The book would be a very valuable help in preparation for Latin reading in general, and every college student, and nearly every teacher, in school or college, might profit by it. In basing his work on so large a range of reading, the author had translation at sight in mind. But it seems to me that the resulting number of words is too large.<sup>2</sup> To take extreme illustrations, *vadimonium*, "bail," appears among the nouns occurring from twenty-five to fifty times. But the word does not occur anywhere in the *Gallic War*, and occurs only twice in any of the orations read in the schools. Moreover out of the actual 40 occurrences, which seem a goodly number, 29 are in the single oration *Pro Quinctio*. Again, *medimnum*, "bushel," is given in the same list. It does, to be sure, occur 43 times; but 42 of these occurrences are in a single one of the Verrine orations, and the remaining one in another Verrine. High-school students would not be repaid for time spent in memorizing these words. It is greatly to be wished that Mr. Browne would make another book on the same convenient plan, but confining the vocabulary to the most commonly read high-school Latin.

The other book is Lodge's *Vocabulary of High School Latin* (published by The Teachers College, Columbia University). The

<sup>2</sup> I regret this the more, because I was glad to see, in two brief pages at the end of the book, a mood treatment which I cannot but admire, since it is based largely upon my own, having, for example, the volitive subjunctive, the anticipatory subjunctive, and concession for the sake of argument, which probably came to the author indirectly, through Bennett's grammar, and the subjunctive of obligation or propriety (as the explanation of the subjunctive with *dignus qui*), which must have come directly from the Hale-Buck grammar.

plan is to give the entire vocabulary of Caesar, *B.G.*, i-v, *Cic.*, *Cat.*, *Pomp.*, *Arch.*, and Virgil, *Aen.* i-vi, and to select, for memorizing, 2,000 words that appear five times or more. I quote from the Preface:

The 1,000 words printed in bold-faced type contain the words of most frequent occurrence in Caesar. They should be learned by the end of the Caesar year, 500 having probably been learned during the first year. The 500 words printed in large Roman type are found most often or first in Cicero and should be learned by the end of the third year. The remaining 500 words, printed in small capitals, should be learned by the end of the Virgil year.

And again:

I have added, in order to make up 2,000 in round numbers, a certain number of words that occur less often than five times, and eight words that are not found at all. These are *gracilis* and seven numerals, that were necessary for brief but systematic treatment of the numerals. Of the remainder, some have been added for grammatical reasons, because it is simpler to learn a complete list than to omit one or two; some because study of other authors shows them to be important; a few because they are identical in form with words included and consequently are best learned together with their homonyms.

The words added to make the 2,000 are not distinguished to the eye, as they might easily have been—for example by an asterisk or a dagger. Moreover, I suspect that Lodge has been too desirous of dividing up his round 2,000 words exactly by multiples of 500, and has thus put into bold-faced type words which are *not* “of most frequent occurrence” in Caesar (i-v) and, sometimes, words which are not common in Caesar (i-v) and Cicero (*Cat.*, *Pomp.*, *Arch.*) taken together, or even in these and Virgil (*Aen.* i-vi) taken together. Thus *paenitet*, which occurs but once in the *Gallic War*, and but three times (in two passages) in all the vocabulary of high-school Latin put together, is put in bold-faced type; and so are *miseret* and *misereor*, which do not occur *at all* in either the Caesar or the Cicero. This would seem to have been done for the sake of the “complete list” of the rule. But the same reasoning would demand that *piget*, *pudet*, and *taedet* should be in the same type; and they are not, though *pudet* appears three times in Cicero. *Decipio* is in bold-faced

type, though it occurs only once in the Caesar reading, and not at all in the Cicero. Adverbs, too, are not treated separately from nouns and adjectives, with figures of their own (thus *partim, modo, turpiter*). It is of course also inevitable that other workers should differ from the author about the words *important* to memorize in the Caesar year, and therefore to be put into bold-faced type. I should not so class *gravo*, which appears but once in the Caesar reading (here *gravor*), and once in the Cicero, while omitting *afficio*, which Lodge says occurs 5 times in Caesar. *Arbitror*, which occurs 29 times in Caesar, and *despero*, which occurs 11 times, I should most unhesitatingly put in bold-faced type, as Lodge does not. The book must therefore be used with discrimination by anyone who wishes to see whether he is asking, in an examination paper, for those words only that are fairly common in the authors of the corresponding reading. Merely to look at the type will not be sufficient. It is to be hoped that changes in the direction of an easier grasp of the facts will be made in a future edition. But at any rate the book, which must have cost heavy labor, does give the facts, and should be employed by everyone who makes an examination paper in composition or in translation at sight, unless he goes directly to his indices of authors.

So much for the keeping of comparatively infrequent words out of examination papers. The other point made above, the keeping out of constructions comparatively rare at the stage reached (together with the getting in of common constructions), is not less important. For help in this, examiners have a recent book, Lee Byrne's *The Syntax of High School Latin* (The University of Chicago Press, 1909).<sup>3</sup> In this, Byrne, with the help of a large number of collaborators, has endeavored to count, and give the book or oration of, every construction occurring in high-school Latin, covering the same field as Lodge, except that (wisely, in my opinion), he includes only four books of Caesar, not five. I do not regard the work as final, but its general plan is excellent, and its aim sound. It ought to be employed by every college examiner, to the end that rare construc-

<sup>3</sup> I have reviewed it on pp. 284-86 of the present issue of this journal.



tions may not be demanded. It is the *common* constructions that should be asked for, not the opposite. If our students, as a rule, could write ordinary Latin well, it would be quite right, and even desirable, to try them upon the rare constructions. As it is, it is neither.

So much for the examination papers. We have found them to be, as a whole, not very carefully planned. In various instances they pass outside the range of ideas of the authors read, they call for words that are not common, and constructions that are not common, and they leave many common constructions uncalled for. Greater pains on the part of those who make them would give greater definiteness to the work of the schools that prepare for them, diminish the danger of unfairness to the candidates, and set a more reasonable ideal before the writers of textbooks in the subject. It is much to be hoped that such pains will be taken, and that the recommendation adopted by the Commission on College-Entrance Requirements in Latin and published in the report will come true, namely: "The words, constructions, and range of ideas called for in the examinations in composition will be such as are common in the reading of the year, or years, covered by the particular examination."

The concluding paper will deal with the present ideals and plans of the books by means of which Latin composition is taught.